DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 561 UD 015 375

AUTHOR Anker, Irving
TITLE Testimony of the Chancellor, Board of Education, City of New York.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE 16 May 74
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Boards of Education; *Classroom Integration; Community Influence; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Opportunities; Metropolitan Areas; Open Enrollment; *Racial Integration; School Districts; *School Integration; School Zoning; Suburban Environment; Urban Environment
IDENTIFIERS *New York City; New York City Commission on Human Rights

ABSTRACT

This document presents the testimony of the Chancellor of the City of New York Board of Education, for the New York City Commission on Human Rights. Opening remarks address the issue of racial integration and the Board of Education's commitment to its adoption as official policy. Six recent actions taken by the Chancellor to promote integration are listed, along with decisions on open enrollment and high school zoning. Although rated along with San Francisco as one of the most successful examples of desegregation in a large metropolitan area by independent studies, the flux of migration, ethnic distributions, and demography are held to deter efforts toward greater progress in integration. Testimony concludes with suggested endeavors for the implementation of the following: a further examination of the programs for integration of the City of New York, the Board of Education, and the Chancellor; a continuation of its objective of stabilizing integrated communities and schools; demands for a statewide program of integrated communities to reduce the isolation of the urban poor and of suburban communities; and, petitions to the State Division of Human Rights to conduct public hearings for the purpose of determining what action is being taken statewide to integrate schools, housing, and other public services. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110561

TESTIMONY OF THE CHANCELLOR
BOARD OF EDUCATION
CITY OF NEW YORK

NEW YORK CITY COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Thursday, May 16, 1974

3 P.M.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD 015375

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Testimony for Human Rights Commission

In 1954, ten years before the Civil Rights Act of 1964, The New York City Board of Education adopted as official policy a firm commitment to the racial integration, where possible, of all New York City schools in the following words:

> It is now the clearly reiterated policy and program of the Board of Education to devise and put into operation a plan which will prevent the further development of (segregated) schools and would integrate the existing ones as quickly as practicable.

A decade has elapsed since the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, two decades since the Board of Education issued its first policy statement. The policy has been vigorously and consistently pursued. The Board of Education and this Chancellor have at no time altered their conviction nor abandoned their commitment to maintaining an optimum racial balance in the schools of New York City.

Why then, has the goal of integration in New York City, as in other inner City areas throughout the country, remained so elusive? There are 1,106,861 public school children in this City, 66 per cent of whom are minority group children. Given this proportion, if all of the city's children attended a single educational complex, the ethnic imbalance would still be conspicuous. Statistical projection based on current data indicates that the trend is toward an increase rather than a decrease of minority enrollment, particularly on the high school level. There are a complex of factors which affect programs for school desegregation and reduction of minority group isolation in New York City:

1. segregated housing
2. unemployment rates
3. influx of minority poor from other geographical areas
4. higher proportion of white and middle class pupils enrolled in non-public schools
5. exodus of white and middle class families to the suburbs

None of these social phenomena are under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education, nor within the purview of the schools.

The New York City Board of Education and the Chancellor have been consistent in their unwavering determination to integrate New York City schools on all levels where at all possible.

Actions Taken by the Chancellor

Recent actions taken by the Chancellor to promote integration include the following decisions:

1. In District 18, the Chancellor ordered the district to continue to provide services for children zoned from Tilden Houses.

2. In the same district, one J.H.S., 68, and three elementary schools, P114, P115, P276, where the proportion of minority group children was below the level for an integrated school, the Chancellor ordered that integration be promoted by intra-district transfers to increase minority group enrollment.

3. In Districts where there were school with predominantly white enrollment, the Chancellor ordered immediate action to admit additional minority students from other districts. Where such orders were resisted (District 20), supersession by the Chancellor's office was effected.

4. In one District a school was integrated largely with white students from a nearby district. The sending district demanded that their students be returned to integrate a school in their own district. The Chancellor rejected the plan.

In instances where districts sought to take action that might deter integration or have a negative impact on progress toward integration, the Chancellor overruled such action despite strong community resistance and appeals:

1. In District 22, the Chancellor rejected plans to recap intermediate schools as contrary to the furthering of integration.

2. In District 6, the creation of a K-8 elementary school was prevented partly because it would have had a negative impact on integration in a nearby junior high school.

Open Enrollment

There are a few districts left in New York City where there are still some schools, mostly on the elementary level, in which the enrollment is still predominantly white. Districts 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 26 have been ordered to make virtually all of these schools available for Open Enrollment, except where unique conditions, primarily overutilization exist. These schools constitute less than 10 percent of the 1000 schools in New York City. All others have at least 20 percent minority enrollment. (Tables I, II attached)

High School Zoning

To further the goals of integration in the high schools, zoning is altered

when school population changes, to provide maximum integration even to assigning middle class students from their immediate communities to high schools in other neighborhoods. This is accomplished in the face of some resistance on the part of isolated community groups, who on occasion, have carried their fight to the courts to block action. (Students who lived within walking distance of Forest Hills High School were bussed to Hillcrest High School to promote integration).

High school zoning is revised and zoning patterns modified periodically when new schools open, old schools close, or when new programs are introduced, to increase the opportunities for minority group children to attend integrated schools.

In northern Queens, Cardozo, John Bowne, Francis Lewis, and Hillcrest High Schools, all admit students from Jamaica and other Queens areas with large minority group population.

In Brooklyn, minority group enrollment has been increased in all high schools where proportion of non-white students fell below 30 percent.

Of the twenty-five comprehensive high schools in Brooklyn, there are still several in which minority enrollment is below 30 percent. There is at least room for serious question as to whether it would serve the cause of integration for the students in currently integrated schools if up to one third of the white students in these schools were removed to schools that were formerly integrated and have in recent years become racially isolated. Would such action benefit the minority students who remained in the school? I suggest there may be an area of reasonable

doubt if such a procedure would have a positive effect upon integration. The Brooklyn zoning plan, released in March 1974, projects a minimum 30 percent minority enrollment in every comprehensive academic high school in the borough by 1977 despite the protest of some community groups.

In the Bronx, in the only two high schools remaining with more than 50 percent white enrollment (Christopher Columbus and Herbert Lehman), we are now making even more seats available to students from other schools zones containing primarily minority group students.

Where new high schools have been constructed, Hillcrest in Queens, North Central in Brooklyn, the Chancellor ordered that zoning lines be drawn for maximum integration, sometimes in the face of resistance from some community people who do not accept the concept of busing for integration purposes.

Every high school built in the last twenty years has been situated in a middle class or fringe area to draw students from as broad and representative a population sampling as possible. South Shore High School, for example, was built in a middle class neighborhood in Brooklyn, close to a bus line providing transportation for more than 2000 minority group students from Central Brooklyn.

The new Harry S. Truman High School in the Northeast Bronx Education Park has a 46.2 percent minority student enrollment as a result of an open admissions program, in addition to the children from a minority housing development located in its regular zone who attend the school.

For years, the New York City Board of Education has selected sites for new schools as close as possible to middle class or borderline areas in order to expand the geographic area from which students are drawn.

This policy has been endorsed by civil rights and community leaders on many occasions. In 1966 the Reverend Milton A. Galamison, later a member of the Board of Education, petitioned the State Department of Education for an order staying the construction of four elementary and three intermediate schools in the East Central Brooklyn area of the school district of the City of New York. The stay order was issued on June 4, 1966. The position of the appellants that was upheld was that the construction of the schools in that area would constitute de facto segregation.

These efforts toward greater progress in integration have been hampered not by ill will or lack of imaginative planning. I quote from the New York Times, Sunday, May 12,1974,"not by judges, not by the recalcitrant (Southern) School Board or deputies with snarling dogs, but by the hard facts of demography, ethnicity, and the inexorable flux of human migration."

It is this in and out migration that has caused high schools, junior high schools and elementary schools, which were fully integrated a few years ago, to become largely minority populated schools. (Tables 111, IV, V attached). The middle class,members of all ethnic groups, has been abandoning the inner city to the poor, largely Black and Hispanic. By 1966, the number of "minority group" students had exceeded "others" on all public school level making statistical integration virtually

impossible in the inner city. The question as to whether or not integration can be a viable alternative where the population distribution is overwhelmingly Black and Hispanic must be realistically examined. The data on ethnic composition of all schools in the City of New York in 1972 define the problems. City wide, there are 808,492 minority group children of public school age. Of these, 77,190 or 9.5 percent attend non-public schools. There are 752,834 non-minority group children (largely white) of public school age. Of these 355,140 or 47.2 percent attend non-public schools. Hence, even if the school population were stabilized and distributed on the basis of the present data, the ethnic imbalance could not be corrected. Let's examine the problem against the backdrop of hard data based on the present ethnic distribution in Brooklyn. If every elementary school reflected the borough wide ethnic proportion, each school in Brooklyn would have an enrollment of 68 percent Black and Puerto Rican children, and 32 percent "others." In the Bronx, the distribution would be 81 percent Black and Puerto Rican, and 19 percent "others." In Manhattan, the figures would be 72 percent Black and Puerto Rican, and 28 percent "others." If we add to this the 1.4 percent annual attrition rate for whites in New York City projected for three years, the percentage of "others" would be further diminished.

In the last ten years the average loss per year of "others" on the elementary level has been 1.2 percent; on the intermediate school and junior high school level, the loss has been 1.5 percent; on the academic and vocational high school level, 2.2 percent. All levels, city-wide, reflect a loss of 1.4 percent each year.

The absolute loss of "others" in the 1964-73 time span is distributed as follows:

elementary schools - 11.6 percent
intermediate and junior high schools - 15 percent
academic and vocational high schools - 22 percent

Overall, for all levels, the absolute loss of "others" in New York City in ten years has been 14.3 percent.

To decry segregation developments that have impacted American cities, while ignoring the deliberate isolation of suburban areas outside the city limits, is to doom effective integration in the large cities to inevitable failure. In Nassau and Suffolk Counties, communities neighboring on New York City, there are 130 school districts. Only four districts of the 130 have an overwhelmingly minority pupil population, and each of these districts is located close to larger districts with a predominantly "others" enrollment. Racially isolated enclaves are rigidly contained and politically sanctioned. Unfortunately, in our cities and our suburbs mirority group children often continue to attend racially isolated schools. It is only in cities like New York City that a white child will rarely if ever go to public schools for twelve years without having had some reasonably integrated schooling. If integration is the sine qua non of education, can we continue to ignore the blatant contradiction of one set of standards for the inner city and another for adjoining suburbs? Perhaps the time has come for all of us who have a professional and emotional commitment to integrated education to call this anomaly to the attention of our political leaders. Integration cannot be achieved in fragments. A total approach must include all areas where the possibility of integration exists.

The problems attendant upon integration are by no means limited to New York City. An up-dated (1973) study of major cities in the country demonstrates that in Chicago, Black and Spanish-surnamed students now constitute 70 percent of the student population (in 1970 the percentage was 64 percent). In Philadelphia 65 percent; In Detroit, the population is now 70 percent Black (65 percent in 1970). In Baltimore, the ratio is 70 percent "minority" to 30 percent "others." In Washington, D.C., the figure is now 97 percent (96 percent Black, 1 percent Hispanic, 3 percent "others"). Other major cities in the country report similar trends. (Table VI attached)

The rule of "reasonableness" enunciated by Judge Weinstein in his decision involving Mark Twain Jr. High School in District 21, is germane in this contest. I quote from Judge Weinstein's remarks:

> The conclusion that the state has a responsibility to eliminate segregation and that its failure to exercise its powers to that end constitutes an unconstitutional state activity carried to its logical extreme has broad implications. It would lead, as plaintiff's expert explicitly proposed in his testimony in this case, to a mixing of school populations in the entire New York metropolitan area to insure that no child was compelled to attend a racially segregated school. For an area as large as New York City or Metropolitan New York, the problems of <u>practicability</u> become critical. Desegregation may cause such a loss of time and such confusion as to outweigh any possible advantages to the students or society. To require equalization of racial and ethnic percentages in smaller areas such as Brooklyn might also prove abortive because the central portions have such high proportions of Black students. <u>Desegregation that results in every school having an overwhelming Black and Hispanic student body accomplishes little</u>. <u>This suggests that the rule may include an element of reasonableness</u>.

This New York City Board of Education and this Chancellor have demonstrated their unqualified commitment to integration and two recent studies by in-

dependent researchers cite New York as outstanding in its efforts to promote integration.

The National Opinion Research Center of Chicago and the Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, recently conducted a study of northern school desegregation in 91 cities. New York City and San Francisco are rated as the two most successful examples of desegregation in very large metropolitan areas. To quote from the study:

> New York City's numerous controversies over education have received a great deal of attention and obscured the fact that over the past ten years the City school system has done a reasonably good job of desegregating...at least it has done a great deal more than other large cities...

Urban System Performance, edited by Herbert Walberg, published by McCutchen Publishing Corporation, conducted a study of school performance in six cities: Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and New York. It states:

> The New York schools are the least segregated with Detroit, Philadelphia and Los Angeles schools between two extremes.

We shall continue to work toward achieving integration and bend all our energies to fulfilling our responsibility to the children of New York City as well as to obeying the Civil Rights Act in spirit and letter.

May I quote from the recently issued Integration Report:

> One promising note is the growing recognition that school integration is not simply a function of the school system, but involves other agencies, especially those responsible for housing.

> The trend toward racially imbalanced public schools in our large cities must receive the attention of responsible officials, educational and governmental, as well as of our community leaders in all areas of the public interest. While continuing to hold city school authorities responsible for creative programs to promote feasible integration in urban schools, state and national officials and law makers cannot ignore the fact that the correction of the growing isolation of our poor minority groups in urban schools is each year becoming less and less a condition which large city Boards of Education can deal with alone.

And may I urge upon this Commission that it use its good offices in the future to:

1. continue to examine the programs for integration of the City of New York, The Board of Education, and the Chancellor.

2. continue to promote its objective of stabilizing integrated communities (and schools).

3. demand of public officials and legislators a statewide program of integrated communities to reduce the isolation of the urban poor and of suburban communities.

4. petition the State Division of Human Rights to conduct public hearings for the purpose of determining what action is being taken statewide to integrate schools, housing and other public services.

ATTACHMENTS

TABLE I	-	SCHOOLS WITH LESS THAN 20% MINORITY ENROLLMENT, SHOWING OPEN ENROLLMENT SCHOOLS
TABLE II	-	SCHOOLS WITH MORE THAN 80% "OTHERS"
TABLE III	-	ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS FORMERLY INTEGRATED NOW RACIALLY IMBALANCED
TABLE IV	-	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS FORMERLY INTEGRATED NOW RACIALLY IMBALANCED
TABLE V	-	ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOLS FORMERLY INTEGRATED, NOW RACIALLY IMBALANCED
TABLE VI	-	ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS POPULATION (1973) NEW YORK CITY AND OTHER LARGE CITIES

TABLE I

SCHOOLS WITH LESS THAN 20% MINORITY ENROLLMENT

District	School	(X) OPEN Enrollment	Reason for No Open Enrollment
2	P. 3	X	
	26		On Governor's Island
	130		Overutilized
	158	X	
8	14		Overutilized
10	24		Overutilized
	80		Is an Annex to PS 9
	81		Overutilized
18	114)		District 18 has been ordered to integrate these schools. They are doing this by intra-district transfers.
	115)		
	276)		
20	48	X	
	102	X	
	104	X	
	105	X	
	112	X	
	163	X	
	170	X	
	176	X	
	185	X	
	186	X	
	200	X	
	204	X	
	205	X	
	229	X	
	247	X	
21	97	X	
	99	X	
	100		Waived because school feeds IS 303 (57% "0") on Coney Island
	101	X	
	128	X	
	153	X	
	177	X	
	209	X	
	215	X	
	216		Waived because of potential feed into IS 303, Coney Island
	226	X	
	238	X	

TABLE I page 2

District	School	(X) Open Enrollment	Reason for No Open Enrollment
22	52	X	
	193	X	
	195	X	
	197	X	
	203	X	
	206	X	
	207	X	
	217	X	
	222	X	
	236	X	
	254	X	
	255	X	
	277	X	
	312	X	
24	12		Overutilized
	13		Overutilized
	49	X	
	71	X	
	81	X	
	87	X	
	88	X	
	89		Overutilized
	91	X	
	102		Overutilized
	113	X	
	128	X	
	153	X	
	199		Overutilized
	229	X	
25	21	X	
	22		Overutilized
	29		Poor Location
	32		Construction going on
	79		Poor Location
	107		Used to relieve PS 22 Q
	120		Poor Location
	169	X	
	184	X	
	193	X	
	209	X	

TABLE I page 3

District	School	(X) Open Enrollment	Reason for No Open Enrollment
26	26	X	
	94	X	
	98	X	
	133	X	
	159	X	
	173	X	
	186	X	
	187	X	
	203	X	
	205	X	
	213	X	
27	47		Overutilized
	51		Fully utilized
	60		Overutilized
	62		Overutilized
	64		Undergoing modernization
	66	X	
	97	X	
	100		Overutilized
	108		Used as annex to Adams H.S.
	114		In Far Rockaway
	146	X	
	207	X	
	232		Overutilized
28	99		Construction of new wing
	117		Fully utilized
	174	X	
	196	X	
	206		Fully utilized
29	33		Used to relieve P.S. 34
	131		Space used for classes of brain injured
	195		Overutilized
30	2		Poor location
	11	X	
	69	X	
	70		Overutilized
	84	X	
	85	X	
	152	X	
31			There is no open enrollment program in Richmond at present time

TABLE II

SCHOOLS WITH MORE THAN 80% "OTHERS"

Borough	School	District	% Others
Manhattan	P26	2	85.0
Bronx	P14	8	95.5
Bronx	P80	10	80.9
Brooklyn	P114	18	96.3
Brooklyn	P115	18	97.3
Brooklyn	P276	18	97.2
Brooklyn	J68	18	93.0
Brooklyn	P171	19	83.8
Brooklyn	P48	20	83.3
Brooklyn	P102	20	80.3
Brooklyn	P104	20	80.5
Brooklyn	P112	20	89.1
Brooklyn	P127	20	89.0
Brooklyn	P170	20	80.6
Brooklyn	P176	20	86.6
Brooklyn	P186	20	90.5
Brooklyn	P200	20	85.5
Brooklyn	P204	20	91.3
Brooklyn	P205	20	89.8
Brooklyn	P229	20	83.2
Brooklyn	P247	20	90.5
Brooklyn	P97	21	92.6
Brooklyn	P100	21	88.0
Brooklyn	P101	21	92.4
Brooklyn	P153	21	84.1
Brooklyn	P177	21	82.4
Brooklyn	P209	21	84.7
Brooklyn	P215	21	86.6
Brooklyn	P216	21	88.0
Brooklyn	P226	21	82.5
Brooklyn	J96	21	82.4
Brooklyn	J228	21	82.4
Brooklyn	P52	22	80.5
Brooklyn	P119	22	91.6
Brooklyn	P197	22	87.3
Brooklyn	P203	22	89.0
Brooklyn	P206	22	87.6
Brooklyn	P207	22	97.9
Brooklyn	P222	22	93.4
Brooklyn	P236	22	95.3
Brooklyn	P277	22	93.4
Brooklyn	P312	22	92.2
Brooklyn	J78	22	88.9
Brooklyn	J234	22	82.6
Brooklyn	J278	22	86.6
Queens	P49	24	86.6
Queens	P71	24	83.5
Queens	P81	24	89.3
Queens	P87	24	82.9
Queens	P88	24	84.9
Queens	P91	24	87.3
Queens	P113	24	80.3
Queens	P128	24	91.4
Queens	P153	24	86.2
Queens	P229	24	83.9
Queens	J119	24	85.5
Queens	P29	25	85.9
Queens	P32	25	87.4
Queens	P79	25	92.8
Queens	P107	25	83.1
Queens	P129	25	95.3
Queens	P169	25	88.4
Queens	P193	25	92.1
Queens	P209	25	81.6
Queens	J25	25	90.7
Queens	J185	25	83.4
Queens	J194	25	89.7
Queens	P94	26	86.0
Queens	P98	26	84.1
Queens	P159	26	84.1
Queens	P186	26	82.2
Queens	P203	26	83.1
Queens	P47	27	100.0
Queens	P51	27	87.6
Queens	P60	27	94.1
Queens	P62	27	88.2
Queens	P64	27	89.6
Queens	P66	27	82.7
Queens	P97	27	88.0
Queens	P100	27	83.9
Queens	P108	27	90.7
Queens	P114	27	93.1
Queens	P146	27	83.8
Queens	P207	27	92.3
Queens	P232	27	95.1
Queens	P33	29	87.8
Queens	P195	29	95.4
Queens	P2	30	93.6
Queens	P84	30	85.5
Queens	P85	30	88.8
Richmond	P1	31	96.4

TABLE II page 2

(cont'd)

Borough	School	District	% Others
Richmond	P3	31	96.4
Richmond	P4	31	90.9
Richmond	P5	31	98.0
Richmond	P8	31	97.2
Richmond	P11	31	94.8
Richmond	P19	31	90.2
Richmond	P21	31	81.6
Richmond	P22	31	95.1
Richmond	P23	31	98.3
Richmond	P26	31	97.9
Richmond	P29	31	91.3
Richmond	P30	31	98.9
Richmond	P32	31	99.1
Richmond	P35	31	93.5
Richmond	P36	31	99.8
Richmond	P38	31	88.0
Richmond	P39	31	90.8
Richmond	P41	31	95.9
Richmond	P42	31	98.7
Richmond	P45	31	91.2
Richmond	P46	31	89.6
Richmond	P48	31	91.2
Richmond	P50	31	98.0
Richmond	P52	31	93.9
Richmond	P53	31	98.3
Richmond	P54	31	90.2
Richmond	P55	31	96.9
Richmond	J2	31	95.6
Richmond	J7	31	97.1
Richmond	J24	31	98.9
Richmond	J34	31	93.2
Richmond	J51	31	88.5

Academic High Schools

Borough	School	% Others
Queens	Grover Cleveland High School	80.7
Richmond	New Dorp High School	95.8
Richmond	Port Richmond High School	84.4
Richmond	Tottenville High School	97.1
Richmond	Susan Wagner High School	82.2

Vocational High Schools

Borough	School	% Others
Brooklyn	Wm.E. Grady Vocational & Technical High School	87.3
Queens	T. A. Edison Vocational & Technical High School	84.5

SCHOOLS WITH MORE THAN 80 PER CENT OTHERS

Level	Total No. Of Schools	Total Schools Excluding Richmond	Richmond Schools
City-wide	130	93	37
Elem.	107	79	28
J.H.S.	16	11	5
Acad. H.S.	5	1	4
Voc.H.S.	2	2	0
Special	0	0	0

TABLE III

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS FORMERLY INTEGRATED NOW RACIALLY IMBALANCED

MANHATTAN

School	Dist.	Per Cent 1960	1964	1973
P19	1	52.2		24.1
110	1	59.9	52.7	21.6
122	1	64.4		23.6
42	2	51.9		5.1
130	2	67.4		3.9
199	3		56.5	19.6
132	6	62.4		20.4
189	6		65.4	29.6

BROOKLYN

School	Dist.	Per Cent 1960	1964	1973
P17	14	53.6		10.0
31	14	64.7		31.4
124	15	63.0		22.7
127	15		51.6	28.7
92	17		68.4	14.3
161	17	61.7		3.5
181	17		65.4	15.5
241	17	68.1		4.6
76	19		69.3	13.0
158	19	51.3		0.5
159	19	63.6		5.7
182	19	62.4		0.1
202	19	62.6		0.9
224	19		67.3	8.8

BRONX

School	Dist.	Per Cent 1960	1964	1973
P36	8	50.8	57.5	20.7
69	8	64.1	57.8	13.7
93	8	57.3	52.9	3.1
100	8		51.3	11.4
119	8	59.7	67.5	27.9
11	9		55.7	1.9
28	9		60.4	9.0
70	9		53.1	3.5
88	9		59.8	6.1
85	10	62.8		8.0
78	11		51.5	14.5
57	12	64.1		0.9
67	12	63.2		0.2
77	12	55.0		5.6
92	12	59.8		1.5
102	12		69.3	27.9

QUEENS

School	Dist.	Per Cent 1960	1964	1973
P42	27	61.6	63.4	20.5
124	27	68.1		8.1
121	28		64.6	15.5
52	29		55.2	1.8
95	29	63.3		21.2
134	29	66.7		0.5
176	29	68.8		6.1
111	30		51.2	21.2

TABLE IV

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS FORMERLY INTEGRATED NOW RACIALLY IMBALANCED

Borough	District	School	PER CENTS 1960	1964	1973
Manhattan	2	J65	-	64.4	4.2
Bronx	8	J123	63.7	-	3.0
		125	51.0	-	9.4
	9	117	-	69.6	8.1
	10	J45	-	64.4	28.7
		79	-	66.5	17.3
		115	-	68.9	11.5
	11	J113	-	61.1	28.6
		142	68.9	57.6	15.6
Brooklyn	15	J51	55.7	-	17.8
		136	67.4	50.9	16.8
	17	J61	58.6	-	7.7
	18	J232	-	67.6	4.3
	19	J64	64.8	-	0.5
		166	66.6	56.1	3.9
Queens	29	J59	56.6	59.9	2.2
		231	-	65.5	31.6

TABLE V

COMPREHENSIVE AND VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOLS

FORMERLY INTEGRATED NOW RACIALLY IMBALANCED

COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOLS

Borough	School	PER CENTS 1960	1964	1973
Manhattan	Seward Park	64.6	58.5	18.2
	George Washington	63.6	60.9	3.8
Bronx	D. Clinton	-	63.6	14.6
	James Monroe	-	60.6	5.2
	T. Roosevelt	-	58.2	7.7
	William Taft	-	68.5	4.2
	Walton	-	57.5	14.9
Brooklyn	Bushwick	-	64.7	10.2
	Eastern District	50.4	-	4.2
	Thomas Jefferson	-	55.9	0.7
	F.K. Lane	-	52.1	16.2
	Prospect Heights	50.4	-	4.2
Queens	Andrew Jackson	-	57.0	4.0

VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOLS

Borough	School	1960	1964	1973
Manhattan	-	-	-	-
Bronx	Samuel Gompers	55.0	-	5.6
Brooklyn	Automotive Trades	56.3	-	28.4
	East New York	56.0	-	13.6
	Alexander Hamilton	65.1	-	4.6
	William H. Maxwell	69.7	59.6	18.0

TABLE VI

ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL POPULATION, 1973
New York City and Other Large Cities
(Updating an Original Table in the Chancellor's Report on Integration)

CITIES	Black	Spanish Surnamed American	Oriental	Other
	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent
New York	37	27	2	34
Chicago	58	12	1	30
Los Angeles	25	26	5	44
Philadelphia	61	4	0	34
Detroit	70	2	0	28
Houston	41	18	0	40
Baltimore	70	0	0	30
Boston	34	6	2	57
Dallas	41	11	0	47
Washington D.C.	96	1	0	3
Cleveland	57	2	0	40
Milwaukee	31	4	0	64
San Francisco	31	14	25	30*

*Includes 3 per cent Polynesians, largely Samoans

Source: Research Departments of the cities that appear in the table